

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of February 15, 2005, claims 1-3 and 5-20 were rejected in view of prior art. The prior art has been carefully considered and amendments have been made to independent claims 1, 9 and 16 which clearly distinguish the present claims from the prior art. In this respect, please note the following comments:

In the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-20 over *Frank* or over *Frank* in combination with various secondary references, the Examiner was considering the first conveyor to be the sub-series or sections of conveyors 271, 272 and 273. As disclosed, each of the conveyor sections 271, 272 and 273 is independently controlled and each has a length which is less than the length of one of the blanks. Thus, each of the conveyor sections 271, 272 and 273 is physically incapable of receiving a plurality of blanks, accelerating with a plurality of blanks thereon or decelerating with a plurality of blanks thereon as expressly required by the present claims. In fact, an inherent requirement of the *Frank* reference is that each of the conveyor sections 271, 272 and 273 is less than the length of one of the articles. Otherwise, the touted benefits of the *Frank* disclosure would not be achieved.

In the Office Action of February 15, 2005, the Examiner comments that "the number of blanks on the first conveyor is immaterial because applicant's sensor 44 activates the speed changing sequence for each article". This comment is not understood.

With respect to the Proposal # 4441, applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's comments or the Examiner's conclusions with respect to that reference. However, even if the subject matter disclosed in Proposal # 4441 was reduced to practice before the filing date of the present application and even if such proposal is considered to place the subject matter disclosed therein as being "on sale" or "in public use", the subject matter of Proposal # 4441 is different than the invention claimed in the present application. Specifically, the subject matter of Proposal # 4441 requires two electric eyes or detecting means, one to detect the position of a given blank for purposes of initiating an acceleration cycle and a second for detecting a further position of the given blank to initiate a deceleration cycle. This is clearly distinguishable from the present invention as claimed in which only a single detection mechanism is required.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above comments, it is believed that the claims in the present application are now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Customer Number 25763

Date: May 11, 2005

By: David N. Fronek

David N. Fronek, Reg. No. 36,762
Intellectual Property Department
Suite 1500
50 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498
(612) 340-2629